

10 December 1963

DOCUMENT NO. \_\_\_\_\_  
NO CHANGE IN CLASS. ( )  
DECLASSIFIED TO \_\_\_\_\_  
CLASS. CHANGED TO: TS S C  
NEXT REVIEW DATE: \_\_\_\_\_  
AUTH: NS TO-2  
DATE: \_\_\_\_\_ APPROVED: 374044

President Eisenhower's UN AddressSoviet Reaction:

Vyshinsky:

Immediately after the speech said that he could not comment until he had studied the text.

Malik:

Made same comment.

Vyshinsky:

Mrs. Pandit reportedly asked his opinion of the speech. She reported him as saying that it was much better than he had expected but that he asked: "Where is the ban?"

In his remarks to the closing GA session he stated: "It should be perfectly clear that, without the adoption of measures for the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon, no strengthening of peace and international cooperation is possible....that without the strict international control of the observance of this prohibition, assurance that atomic energy will be used for peaceful purposes cannot be guaranteed.

"... Without measures to guarantee these important factors, one cannot begin to think of a reduction of the destructive potential of the world's stock of atomic energy which could guarantee a new approach to the question of using atomic and hydrogen weapons, and other weapons of mass destruction, for such purposes."

CONFIDENTIAL

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

- 2 -

Pravda:

Published an 800-word summary of the speech. It was essentially fair in that it included the essence of the American proposals. However, it made no mention of the references to the US atomic potential and through the very process of summarization destroyed to some extent the effect which the reading of the entire speech produces.

Pravda's only comment was contained in the final sentence which said:

"However, in his speech President Eisenhower did not express his attitude on the question of the prohibition of atomic armaments."

TASS:

Transmitted a summary of the speech (approximately 800 words).

This is probably the summary published in Pravda.

Commentaries:

Leontyev, considered the leading foreign affairs commentator of Radio Moscow, commented on the speech in the last two paragraphs of his lengthy attack on the joint Bermuda communique.

He charged that:

- 1) Like the Bermuda communique, Eisenhower's "belligerent speech" evidenced no desire on the part of the Western powers (particularly the US) to lessen world tension;
- 2) "Eisenhower actually came out with a threat of atomic warfare";

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

- 3 -

- 3) He praised the "policy of force";
- 4) He pursued a "new version of the same old Baruch plan which repudiates the need to ban atomic weapons and enforce strict control over the enforcement of the ban."

Orlov, a Radio Moscow commentator of lesser importance who usually handles material to be beamed to North America, attacked the speech at greater length.

This commentary, however, has been beamed only to North America so far (11 December).

He asserted that:

- 1) The address lacked concrete proposals (for peace among nations);
- 2) If the President proved to be so familiar with the terrifying destructiveness of the atom bomb, he should realize the need for outlawing atom and hydrogen bombs urgently and unconditionally;
- 3) Eisenhower carefully evaded any mention of the proposals brought up in the United Nations by the Soviet delegation, -- proposals which outline concrete measures toward solving the atomic problem;
- 4) He gave no explanation as to why US delegates in the United Nations so stubbornly oppose

CONFIDENTIAL

- 4 -

- 5) He described the horrible devastation of atomic warfare not to convince his listeners that atomic weapons must be outlawed, but to scare his listeners with atomic war;
- 6) His words really could be applauded if an when actions are made to fit the words.

TASS:

Transmitted to European audiences a New York round-up of editorial comment selected for the purpose of supporting initial Soviet propaganda reaction. For instance, a New York Times editorial was said to have claimed that the West has now seized the initiative not only in diplomatic efforts to reach peace but in the cold war. The New York Herald Tribune (Lippmann) was quoted at length to "prove" that the new proposal does not even pretend to limit or regulate stocking of atomic weapons ... "the mainstay" of our (US) military power.

The New York Daily Mirror was quoted as having labelled the speech as an excellent propaganda effort, and as having pointed out that the scheme has pitfalls in which the US could suffer misfortunes and disasters.